

## **Proposition 84—IRWMP Grant Program Stakeholder Input**

### **Performance Based vs. Competitive Program**

Advantages of Performance-Based Program (from a DAC perspective):

1. Opportunity to develop a strong planning document, because the process is not deadline driven and DAC's are new to this planning process and somewhat unprepared.
2. Ability to benefit from DWR technical input and assistance during the planning process and during the implementation of programs that meet the highest needs.
3. Possibility of grant funding for planning is a huge opportunity for the DAC community and will allow cooperative efforts among the groups working on DAC Issues, resulting in more cost efficient programs in the regions.

Observations regarding a Performance-Based Program (from a DAC perspective):

1. While DACs will benefit from a process that is not as deadline driven, some means for monitoring progress and performance would seem to be needed. Perhaps some sort of a mutually-developed performance agreement with reporting deadlines and metrics would be in order.
2. The idea of meeting pre-established benchmarks for obtaining a planning grant is difficult to evaluate without some understanding of what benchmarks are to be used. The benchmarks and standards should be developed in a collaborative statewide process to insure implementability. For DACs benchmarks can turn into barriers and defeat the DWR's good intention, if not the result of a collaborative process
3. The planning activity will require resources that may be minimal or incidental to a large agency, but significant to a DAC. Asking the DAC to participate in a planning process, means it will put important time and expense into the effort. Some certainty of receiving funding for the project needs to be provided or compensation for the DAC involvement, so that the DAC's risk of participating in a planning effort is minimized.
4. Performance-Based Program approach seems to have some conflict with previous requirements of Prop 50. A thoughtful transition plan and outreach will be needed for this to be successful.
5. Under a Performance-Based Program, agencies with larger resources or agencies funded under Prop 50 would seem to be better situated to obtain Prop 84 funding than DACs. Is a specific set-aside program or fund for DACs planned? Or, will agencies with prior awards need to wait for the DAC planning effort to be completed?

6. For agencies that have received Planning and Implementation grants under Prop 50, metrics should be added to their grant contracts to require them to coordinate with DAC's. The same should be in all future IRWM programs.

### **IRWM Plan Standards**

Observations regarding IRWM Plan standards:

1. Region Description: Because DACs may be pockets within a given region, the region description standard needs to understand that DACs are often non-contiguous populations with unconnected systems, but common problems and needs. With focus on the programmatic nature of the need in the areas, one can cover the region rather than the few areas where they rise to the level of an entire region. The Mission Springs area almost in its entirety is Disadvantaged, but the Coachella Valley and Colorado River Region is not.
2. Water Management Strategies: The water management strategies contained in the standards are reflective of the complex needs of an area seeking to optimize and integrate its resources. The DAC challenge in trying to address the water management strategies is that DAC needs are quite basic. While others may be seeking to build an integrated, complex strategy, DACs are trying merely to build a foundation for basic functions. For DACs the focus should be on raising their level of service and showing integration with the broader programs.
3. Perhaps DACs would derive collateral benefits if the water management strategies standard required program participants to outline instances in which essential functions are not being met within the region.
4. DACs should have a prominent role in advisory committees and regional governance standards should require their participation. DWR may wish considering including DAC endorsement as a part of IRWM Plan standards.
5. A companion point to DAC involvement in governance as outlined above, would be Plan standards that insure inclusive governance, in recognition that no one or two agencies can discern the multi-faceted needs of an entire region.

### **Disadvantaged Communities**

Observations regarding Disadvantaged Communities:

1. The need in the Colorado River Funding area is not for the DACs to determine how to engage in the IRWM process, but for the DACs to become leaders in the process, especially in the face of disinterest or indifference by other agencies.
2. Early and effective assistance is needed from DWR in helping leverage the existing fundamental capabilities that will then grow to become the DACs' foundation for addressing more complex issues.
3. MSWD has engaged DAC leaders from the Coachella Valley and is willing, in participation with DWR and others to include the entire Colorado River Funding

Area. To that end we are willing to put forward a proposal for accomplishing this effort if DWR will receive it.

## **Disadvantaged Communities**

### **Comment Summary from Previous Efforts –**

Incentives to reduce cost share for DAC did not address hardships DACs face engaging the IRWM process.

### **DWR Concept for IRWM Grant Program –**

Through Prop 84 DWR does have the means to provide some technical assistance and financial assistance to help DAC engage in their regional IRWM processes. DWR is considering implementing this assistance early in the process so DAC's can engage more fully in IRWM planning and/or application preparation processes. DWR is also considering allocating funding to projects that meet critical needs of DACs.

### **Input Questions –**

What types of technical assistance would be helpful to augment your region's efforts to engage DACs in the IRWM process?

- *Functionality of a regional plan*
- *Public understanding of IRWM plan benefits and commitments*
- *Co-ordinate various participants/facilitate participants working together*

Are there specific functions that DWR personnel can provide in the IRWM process that would help engage DACs?

- *Planning assistance*
- *Funding help*
- *Facilitation with regulatory agencies*

In addition to technical assistance, is there also need for financial assistance and how do you envision those funds being used?

### **Uses of financial assistance by DACs:**

- **Planning—creating the IRWM plan**
- **Coordinating—engaging the diverse interests**
- **Communicating—public outreach efforts**
- **Group process facilitation/ Issue resolution**
- **Plan implementation**